DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 383 CS 502 990

AUTHOR Pearson, Judy C.
TITLE An Investigation of the Effects of Sexism and Sex Role Identification on the Criticism of Classroom Speeches.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Evaluation Criteria; Females; Higher Education; Males; Research; *Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Speech Communication; Speech Skills

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to clarify the inconsistent research findings on the effects of the sex of the evaluator and the sex of the speaker in classroom speech criticism by examining the effects of the sex role identification and the sexism of the evalutor. One hundred twenty-three college students enrolled in a basic public speaking course completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory, which measures a person's femininity, masculinity, or androgyny, and the Pearson Response to Sexism, which measures an individual's perceptions of the differences between sex roles. Throughout the quarter-long course, the students were randomly assigned to critique the speeches of other students. Approximately ten people critiqued each of the speakers. At the end of the course, ten critiques of male speakers and ten critiques of female speakers were randomly selected for each evaluator and the total points assigned to each speech by the evaluator was recorded. The results showed that feminine females tended to be more lenient in their criticism than androgynous persons, who, in turn, were more lenient than masculine males. In addition, sexist evaluators were more harsh than were nonsexist evaluators. A high correlation between sex and sexism demonstrated that women were most often nonsexist and that men were most often sexist in their evaluations. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192383

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF SEXISM AND SEX ROLE IDENTIFICATION ON THE CRITICISM OF CLASSROOM SPEECHES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judy C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Judy C. Pearson

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa 50011

515/294-1287

Presented in the Instructional Development Division Top Three Program, Speech Communication Association Annual Convention, New York, 1980.

CS505990

Classroom speech criticism is regarded as highly important by communication educators and by communication researchers. The importance of criticism in pedagogy is evidenced by theoretical prescriptions[1] and the central role in research is demonstrated by empirical investigations.[2] The reliability and validity of speech criticism in the classroom has been called into question.[3] The empirical data responding to this call are overwhelming, yet contradictory. This inconsistancy is particularly true in the literature which deals with the sex of the evaluator. The research is replete with confusing and contradictory findings.

A number of studies suggest that females are more lenient as evaluators. Pfister found that female student evaluators gave higher ratings to both male and female speakers than did male student evaluators.[4] Sikkink found that women rated persuasive speeches higher for persuasiveness both immediately after a speech and after ten weeks than did men.[5] Miller and McReynolds showed that women tend to rate a male speaker higher than men rated the male speaker.[6] Finally, Bock, Powell, Kitchens, and Flavin demonstrated that female raters made more leniency errors than did male raters.[7]

Other research demonstrates no difference in the critiquing behavior of male and female evaluators. Bryan and Wilke found that men and women were about equally lenient as evaluators.[8] Ruechelle showed that sex differences of the evaluators has no significant bearing on the determination of whether an appeal was emotional or intellectual or on the judgment of the persuasive content.[9] Bostrom and Kemp could find no difference attributable to the sex of the listener in a study which considered the type of speech, the sex of the speaker, and the sex of the subject on the persuasibility of a speech.[10] Sloman could not demonstrate significant sex differences of the evaluator on persuasibility.[11] Finally, Pearson could find no significant differences in the critiquing patterns of male and female high school speech teachers.[12]

Another set of studies focus on specific critiquing behavior rather than one measure of effectiveness. Haiman found that female student evaluators were more generous than males in rating the ethos of speakers.[13] Vigliano showed that female listeners tended to score speakers, regardless of sex, higher than male listeners on trustwothiness and dynamism, but not on competence.[14] Lynn found that 1) females tend to perceive highly credible sources unassociated with any message more favorably

than do males, while males tend to perceive positive communications from highly credible sources more favorably than do females; 2) females tend to perceive source-less subjective messages more favorably than do males, while males tend to perceive source-less objective messages more favorably than do females; and 3) males perceive subjective messages more favorably when the source is specifically identified than when the source is unknown, while females perceive subjective messages more favorably when the source is not identified.[15] Sprague demonstrated that female college speech instructors wrote significantly more delivery comments, positive comments, and personal comments than did male teachers.[16]

A final set of studies on sex differences in the evaluation of classroom speeches suggest a preference of one sex over the one on criticism, but agreement does not exist among these studies. Thompson examined agreement between equivalent sub-groups in an audience and suggested that women may be superior to men in rating ability.[17] Bock, Powell, Kitchens, and Flavin examined rating errors and found that rating effects due to the following effect--the tendency to give an average speaker a lower rating after he or she has followed an outstanding speaker--was an almost exclusive characteristic of female raters and that female raters had significantly more trait errors than males on the trait of general effectiveness. They concluded that

the sex of the rater accounts for the presence or absence of rating errors.[18] Young showed, however, that tudents of female instructors indicated that their criticism was significantly more helpful than did students of male instructors. Critic sex differences were an important variable in perceived helpfulness ratings.[19]

Conflicting and contradictory findings suggest that elusive mediating variables are affecting the results. In the previous studies, a methodological inadequacy might account for the unstable findings. Sex has been defined as a physiological characteristic rather than as a psychological category.

Recent evidence presented by Bem suggests that at least thirty-five percent of the population do not limit their behavior to their sex-type.[20] Her research has demonstrated that a number of people are androgynous or are able to possess both feminine and masculine characteristics. In order to measure a person's femininity, masculinity or androgyny, Bem developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) which is a sixty-item self-report instrument. The test includes sixty personality attributes: twenty feminine (childlike, does not use harsh language, soft-spoken), twenty masculine (assertive, analytical, willing to take risks), and twenty neutral (moody, conscientious, unpredictable).

The development of the BSRI and similar instruments has complicated understanding of human sex role behavior. Such measurements reject the simplistic typology that sex role outcomes fall somewhere along a bipolar dimension ranging from masculine to feminine. Previously, individuals were categorized as masculine or feminine. Recent developments suggest that masculinity and femininity may proceed more or less independently allowing individuals to be both masculine and feminine in their behavioral composition.

Some evidence has accumulated which suggests that the newly defined sex roles are of scientific interest and may have implications for social research. Androgyny has been related to positive self-esteem[21] and behavioral effectiveness[22] in both males and females. Bem demonstrated that androgynous individuals were more likely than either masculine or feminine people to display sex role adaptability across situations. She showed that androgynous subjects of both sexes display "masculine" independence and assertiveness when situationally appropriate and display "feminine" helpfulness, warmth, playfulness and concern when given the opportunity. The non-androgynous subjects, by contrast, were found to display behavioral deficits of one sort or the other and the feminine females appeared to show the greatest deficit of all.[23] Montgomery and Burgoon predicted and found an interaction effect between androgyny and sex of the receiver on attitude change. They demonstrated that feminine females changed their attitudes more than did masculine men and that this difference was

greater than the attitude change obtained with androgynous individuals.[24]

The literature on sex differences in attitude change evidences the same kind of instability that the research on sex differences of the evaluator in speech criticism obtains. As Montgomery and Burgoon reasoned that sex role identification was an intervening mediating variable, it can be hypothesized that sex role identification may be interacting with the sex of the evaluator in speech criticism. An individual's sex role identification may account for differences in classroom rating behavior. It was reasoned that since feminine females demonstrate helpfulness, warmth, playfulness, and concern, they would be more lenient in their classroom criticism. This reasoning is supported by an investigation completed by Bock which demonstrated that easy to persuade people displayed more leniency errors than did difficult to persuade people.[25] Since masculine men display independence and assertiveness, it was reasoned that they would be less lenient. Finally, androgynous people have been shown to demonstrate the characteristics of both men and women, and have positive self-esteem and behavioral effectiveness, and were therefore hypothesized to evaluate classroom speeches somewhere between the lenient feminine females and the harsh masculine men. Further, it was predicted that the criticism by androgynous males and androgynous females would differ less than that by feminine females and masculine men. In sum, the following hypothesis was predicted:

There is an interaction between sex role identification and the sex of the evaluator such that feminine females will be most lenient in grades assigned to classroom speeches, that masculine males will be most harsh, and that androgynous individuals will fall between the two groups.

Another area of conflicting and contradictory findings in speech criticism concerns the sex of the speaker. The field of education provides a sizable body of literature ~~which~~ focuses on the sex of the student. A number of studies have demonstrated that differential treatment of students occurs on the basis of sex even when the male and female students had similar intellectual ability.[26] Teacher disapproval occurs more frequently with males than females[27] and teachers are more likely to use a harsh tone when criticizing boys than girls.[28]

More recent studies have focused on student behavior, rather than on student sex to explain differential treatment.[29] Good, Sikes, and Brophy did not ~~find~~ that teachers favor students of their own sex nor that female teachers are biased against male students. They found, instead, that high achieving male students received the most favorable teacher treatment while low achieving male students received the least favorable treatment.[30] This study contradicts, to some extent, the earlier findings that boys receive

inferior treatment from teachers and suggests, instead, that earlier results were due to lack of categorization within each sex.

Researchers considering the speaker's sex in classroom criticism have similarly provided mixed conclusions. Barker demonstrated that women tend to receive slightly higher ratings on speeches than did men.[31] However, Sloman did not demonstrate a difference in the persuasiveness of male and female speakers.[32] In addition, Pfister found that female student evaluators gave higher ratings to male speakers than they gave to female speakers and that male student evaluators gave higher ratings to female speakers than they gave to male speakers.[33]

Other researchers have considered specific features of male/female speaker difference. Two studies have demonstrated that female speakers receive more positive comments than do male speakers, even when grades are held constant.[34] Vigliano found that female speakers were found to obtain significantly higher scores on all three dimensions of credibility--trustworthiness, competence and dynamism--than did male speakers.[35] Bostrom and Kemp found that female speakers were judged to be more successful when they took a noninstitutional position and that male speakers were more successful when they took an institutional position.[36] Ball considered the relationship between the ability to speak effectively and the primary mental abilities, verbal

comprehension and general reasoning. He found that a low, positive correlation occurred between verbal comprehension and general reasoning with speaking ability for male speakers, but a practical absence of correlation was found for the female subjects. Ball suggests that female speakers might be judged highly because of different skills or abilities than males.[37] Finally, Mulac and Sherman found that speech skill, source credibility, and behavioral speech anxiety improved in male speakers from the beginning to the end of a fundamentals class, but that female speakers did not improve on any of these dimensions.[38]

The confusing findings on the influence of the sex of the speaker in the evaluation of classroom speeches do not result in any stable conclusions. Differential evaluation may be a function of student behavior rather than sex or it may be a function of the evaluator. Interactions between the sex of the evaluator and the sex of the speaker further confound the problem.

Personality traits, attitudes, and predispositions of the evaluator appear to affect evaluation. Bostrom demonstrated that rigid evaluators tended to rate speakers lower than did persons who were non-rigid,[39] and Bock showed that people who are difficult to persuade rated speakers lower than did raters who were easy to persuade.[40] Rigidity and persuasibility are among the evaluators' characteristics

which may affect the speech evaluation process.

The extent to which a person believes that typical behaviors and specific dispositions exist which are appropriate for each of the sexes, or sexism, may affect speech criticism. Sexism may be viewed as one form of dogmatism and may represent rigidity in the rater. Sexism may account for the discrepancy in the findings on the effect of the sex of the evaluator on criticism or on the varying findings of the effect of the sex of the speaker on criticism.

Pearson developed an instrument which measures an individual's perceptions of the differences between the sex roles. The Pearson Response to Sexism (PRS) includes sixty-nine items placed on a five point Likert scale. Forty-nine of the items concern the restriction of particular professions to men, women, or both sexes. Among the professions included are bartender, babysitter, airline pilot, and professional football coach. Respondents select "1," for men only, "5" for women only, "3" for both sexes, and "2" and "4" for positions between these extremes. The additional twenty items request that respondents indicate their attitude about a variety of issues. Respondents use the five point scale to indicate agreement or disagreement with statements like "Women serving in all military positions," An increased number of women in high political office," "Small boys be encouraged to play with dolls," and "More male home economics teachers."

Test-retest reliability on this instrument is reported at .80, internal reliability is .86.[41] Persons are categorized as generally sexist or nonsexist on this scale.

The PRS has been shown to be useful in research on public speaking criticism. Pearson demonstrated that persons who are sexist write less criticism--fewer total comments--than do nonsexist evaluators.[42] However, the instrument has not been used in research which has considered the assigned grade or total number of points for a speech. Sexist and nonsexist evaluators vary in the amount of criticism they offer in written critiques, they may similarly differ in their grading patterns. It is hypothesized that

> Sexist and nonsexist persons will demonstrate significantly different grading patterns in their evaluation of classroom speeches.

METHOD

Procedure

One hundred twenty-three students who were enrolled in the basic public speaking course at a large midwestern university completed the BSRI and the PRS on the first day of class. All of the students had the same instructor and were given identical assignments in the course. Throughout the quarter, the students were randomly assigned to critique the speeches of their fellow students. Approximately ten people critiqued each of the speakers. When the quarter was

completed, ten critiques of male speakers and ten critiques of female speakers were randomly selected for each student. The total points assigned to each speech by the student evaluators was recorded. The results that follow are based on these scores. Incomplete data resulted in a total of 109 evaluators, sixty four males and forty five females, who served as the subjects in this study.

Variables

Four independent variables were examined: the evaluator's sex, the evaluator's sex role identification, the evaluator's sexism, and the speaker's sex. The dependent measure was the total number of points assigned to a particular speech. In order to examine these variables an analysis of variance with unequal n was performed using the Type IV Sum of Squares from the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Correlations among the dependent and independent variables were also run to clarify the relationship among them.

RESULTS

Twenty speech scores (ten for males and ten for females) for each of one hundred and nine student evaluators, or a total of 2,180 scores comprised the data base. The sex of each student evaluator, his or her sex role identification, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, and his or her sexism, as measured by the Pearson Response to Sexism, were recorded for analysis. Evaluators were not placed in masculine, feminine, or androgynous groups,

based on the Bem; instead, their particular score was used since the BSRI provides continual data. Similarly, evaluators were not identified as sexist or nonsexist, based on the Pearson since it, too, provides continual data.

(PLACE TABLE 1 HERE.)

The analysis of variance indicated that a highly significant difference ($F = 11.37$; d. f. = 1, $p < .0011$) occurs on the scores given by sexist and nonsexist evaluators. The interaction between sex and sex role identification was not significant ($F = 1.97$; d. f. = 1, $p < .1636$), but a trend suggesting that masculine men and feminine females give different scores exists. A highly significant difference in the scores assigned to male and female speakers was also found ($F = 12.88$; d. f. = 1; $p < .0005$).

(PLACE TABLE 2 HERE.)

Correlations were run among the variables. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients are provided in Table 2. The correlation between the sum of the scores given to male and female speakers (Y_1) and evaluators' scores on the Pearson Response to Sexism (X_3) ($r = -.33$, 109 d.f., $p < .0003$) is consistent with the highly significant difference that was found in the analysis of variance. Similarly, the smaller correlation between the sum of scores given to male and female speakers (Y_1)

and the interaction of the sex of the evaluator and the sex role identification of the evaluator (X_1X_2) ($r = -.17$, 109 d.f., $p < .0848$) is consistent with the smaller difference that was found in the analysis of variance.

The correlations among the independent variables do provide additional information. The sex of the evaluator (X_1) was correlated with the sex role identification of the evaluator (X_2) ($r = .41$, 109 d.f., $p < .0001$); the sex of the evaluator (X_1) was correlated with the sexism of the evaluator (X_3) ($r = -.20$, 109 d.f., $p < .0338$). Correlations also occurred between the sex role identification of the evaluator (X_2) and the interaction of sex and sex role (X_1X_2) ($r = .32$, 109 d.f., $p < .0008$); between the sex role identification of the evaluator (X_2) and the interaction of sex role and sexism (X_2X_3) ($r = -.21$, 109 d.f., $p < .0272$); and between the sex role identification of the evaluator (X_2) and the interaction of sex, sex role, and sexism ($X_1X_2X_3$) ($r = -.44$, 109 d.f., $p < .0001$). Sexism (X_3) was correlated with the interaction of sex and sexism (X_1X_3) ($r = -.28$, 109 d.f., $p < .0033$) and with the interaction of sex, sex role, and sexism ($X_1X_2X_3$) ($r = .49$, 109 d.f., $p < .0001$). The interaction of sex and sex role (X_1X_2) correlated with the interaction of

sex role and sexism (X_2X_3) ($r = -.39$, 109 d.f., $p < .0001$). The interaction of sex and sexism (X_1X_3) was correlated with the interaction of sex role and sexism (X_2X_3) ($r = .50$, 109 d.f., $p < .0001$).

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis, that an interaction between sex role identification and the sex of the evaluator would occur and that feminine females would be most lenient in the grades they assigned, that masculine males would be the most harsh, and that androgynous individuals would fall between the groups, was not verified. A trend is evidenced in the data, however. Feminine females tend to most lenient in their criticism, androgynous persons appear to be more stringent, and masculine males tend to be most harsh. The lack of a significant difference on this interaction necessitates a cautious interpretation of this trend.

The interaction of evaluator sex and evaluator sex role clearly offers a greater difference than the evaluator sex, alone, or than sex role, alone. Relying on the interaction of sex role and sex appears to be of greater potential utility than merely using biological sex.

biological sex. Recently, the Bem Sex Role Inventory has been challenged.[43] A number of new instruments have been developed which are advertised to improve upon the problems with the Bem scale. For instance, Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp created an instrument, known as the Personal Attributes Questionnaire which distingusihes between masculine, feminine, and androgynous people, as does the Bem, but adds the classification of undifferentiated (those persons who are neither masculine nor feminine).[44] In addition, factor analyses of the BSRI have resulted in multidimensional solutions, rather than the expected unidimensional solution.[45] The psychometric adequacy of the BSRI has been questioned and the instrument, itself, may account for the lack of significant findings on the interaction of the sex and the sex role of the evaluators in this study. Additional research using some of the more recently developed instruments should be considered. Alternatively, correlations between an individual's score on the individual factors of the BSRI and his or her behavior could be considered for clearer explanation. In any case, the results of the current study, while not statistically significant, should encourage the further investigation of the effect of the interaction of sex and sex role on speech critiquing behavior.

The second hypothesis, that sexist and nonsexist persons would demonstrate significantly different grading patterns, was confirmed. This highly significant finding demonstrated that sexist persons are far more harsh in their critiquing behavior than are nonsexist people. This finding adds to the earlier conclusion that sexist people write a smaller amount of criticism than do nonsexist evaluators. In light of the current finding, the PRS should probably be correlated with dogmatism scales, measures of rigidity, and persuasibility instruments.

Interestingly, the correlation among the independent variables offers additional information on this highly significant finding. The sex of the evaluator correlated very highly with his or her sexism. In general, female evaluators were less sexist than were their male counterparts. Sexism, rather than sex role, offers an explanation for the earlier conflicting findings on the difference in sex of the evaluator on the criticism of speeches. The information in this study would suggest that nonsexist people, not women, are more lenient in criticism. Furthermore, the high correlation between nonsexism and the female sex is suggestive of the confusion that might have occurred in studies that attempted to show the influence of sex differences on classroom criticism.

Females were generally less sexist than were males. This finding is not consistent with earlier studies in psychology which suggested that females were more conservative than males and tended to be opposed to social, economic, or governmental innovations. One explanation for the difference in the finding in the current study and earlier research lies in the sample. The female evaluators in this study were college students at a large midwestern university which offers a very difficult academic curriculum. The women in this study had already invested time and energy in attempting to attain professions that required at least a baccalaureate degree. They may have responded to the forty-nine items that dealt with professions on the PRS by suggesting that women could enter more fields that were previously held by men.

An additional explanation for the nonsexism of females arises from a feminist perspective. Sexism tends to hurt women far more than it hurts men. Both women and men are limited to narrow definitions by sexism, but women are more likely to be restricted to positions of little power, influence, or economic support. Women may be more willing than men to experiment with increased options. For women, increased options allow the possibility of a woman as President; for men, increased options may be equated with being a "househusband." Men appear

to have more to lose than do women, and consequently, may be more threatened by the possibility of a nonsexist society.

One significant difference occurred which was not hypothesized. Male and female speakers received different evaluations. Women received higher scores than did men. This result was found in some of the earlier studies, but it was not a consistent finding. It is particularly interesting in this study since no interaction between sexism and differential grading of men and women occurred. At least some of the earlier research which found differences in the speech grades of men and women suggested that sexism, rather than different student behavior, accounted for the difference. Sexism could not be shown to result in differential treatment in this study. Another explanation for the higher scores of women and the lower scores of men lies in student behavior. Good, Sikes, and Brophy demonstrated that early educational research which suggested that some form of sexism might account for the differential treatment of male and female students may have been due to a lack of categorization within each sex and that student behavior, rather than teacher's attitudes might account for such differences.[46] Similarly, early research in speech communication which considered sex differences in speech criticism focused on the evaluator's characteristics rather than on speaker behavior for explanation.

Women may be receiving higher grades on their public speeches than are men simply because they are more effective. Women have been shown to excel in various interpersonal communication skills as well as nonverbal sensitivity. The same skills that women develop to be successful in the interpersonal setting may be operating when they deliver public speeches.

Men and women appear to excel in different aspects of public speaking. Female speakers have been found to receive significantly higher scores on all three dimensions of credibility--trustworthiness, competence and dynamism--than men.[47] A correlation between verbal comprehension and general reasoning occurs with the speaking ability of men, but not with women.[48] Men and women may be judged differently because of their different skills or abilities. The relationship or ethos dimension in which women excel may be judged to be more important in classroom speaking than is the content or logos dimension that appears to be handled more successfully by male speakers in the classroom. Additional study should consider the characteristics of the speaker rather than the characteristics of the evaluator to determine differential grading between men and women. A salient characteristic might be the speaker's sex role identification as well as some of the measures which have been developed primarily for the evaluation of interpersonal communication skills.

Another explanation for the tendency for women to receive higher scores than men lies in the situation. Women may be better at modeling the behavior of the instructor or better at fulfilling the prescriptions given by the instructor. On the one hand, they may be more sensitive to the subtle cues offered by the instructor; on the other hand, they may be more compliant. In either case, the teacher-student relationship and the classroom situation may be influencing their behavior. Further research should examine other situations outside the classroom in which male and female speakers are evaluated. For instance, the political speeches of men and women running for office, the lectures given by male and female college instructors, or the briefings offered by male and female military officers could provide fruitful avenues of research.

This study examined the inconsistent findings on the effect of the sex of the evaluator and the sex of the speaker in the criticism of classroom speeches. The sex role identification of the evaluator and the sexism of the evaluator were hypothesized to hold explanatory power for the confusing findings. An interaction between androgyny and the sex of the evaluator was predicted, but showed only a trend. Feminine females tended to be more lenient than androgynous people, who, in turn,

were more lenient than masculine males. A main effect which predicted that sexist and nonsexist evaluators would differ in their assigning of scores to speakers was found to be highly significant. Sexist evaluators were far more harsh than nonsexist evaluators. A main effect which demonstrated that female speakers receive higher scores than male speakers was not predicted. A high correlation between sex and sex role demonstrated that feminine persons are most often female and that masculine persons are most often male. A high correlation between sex and sexism demonstrated that women are most often nonsexist and that men are most often sexist. While these results add clarification to the earlier cloudy findings, they clearly call for additional consideration.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

OF CLASSROOM SPEECH GRADES

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	p <
Sex of the Evaluator (S)	.6	1	.6	.8691
Sex Role of the Evaluator (R)	13.1	1	13.1	.4518
Sexism of the Evaluator (X)	261.9	1	261.9	.0011
Sex of the Evaluator X Sex Role of the Evaluator (SR)	45.4	1	45.4	.1636
Sex of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator (SX)	21.9	1	21.9	.3321
Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator (RX)	13.4	1	13.4	.4477
Sex of the Evaluator X Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator (SRX)	.6	1	.6	.8689
Error (E/SRX)	2327.1	101	23.04	
Sex of the Speaker (G)	94.6	1	94.6	.0005
Sex of the Evaluator X Sex of the Speaker (SG)	8.4	1	8.4	.2874
Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sex of the Speaker (RG)	12.0	1	12.0	.2033

TABLE 1

(Continued)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	p<
Sexism of the Evaluator X Sex of the Speaker (XG)	1.4	1	1.4	.6608
Sex of the Evaluator X Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sex of the Student (SRG)	0.0	1	0.0	.9961
Sex of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator X Sex of the Speaker (SXG)	3.8	1	3.8	.4703
Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator X Sex of the Student (RXG)	0.0	1	0.0	.9582
Sex of the Evaluator X Sex Role of the Evaluator X Sexism of the Evaluator X Sex of the Student (SRXG)	.4	1	.4	.8172
Error (EG/SRX)	741.3	101	7.3	

TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES

	Y_1	Y_2	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_1X_2	X_1X_3	X_2X_3	$X_1X_2X_3$
Y_1		.030	.076	-.056	-.334*	-.166	-.036	-.001	-.107
Y_2			.105	-.080	-.060	-.018	-.097	.000	-.019
X_1				.415*	-.344*	.144	-.122	.033	-.191±
X_2					-.202±	.317*	.032	-.210±	-.443*
X_3						.027	-.279±	.160	.495*
X_1X_2							-.053	-.390*	-.381*
X_1X_3								.502*	.034
X_2X_3									.167

Y_1 Sum of the scores given to male and female speakers

Y_2 Difference of the scores given to male and female speakers (Male speakers' scores - female speakers' scores)

X_1 Sex of the evaluator

X_2 Sex role identification of the evaluator

X_3 Sexism of the evaluator

* $p < .01$, 109 d.f.

± $p < .05$, 109 d.f.

[1]See, for example, Loren D. Reid, Teaching Speech, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971), p. 268; Waldo W. Braden, "Teaching Through Criticism," in Speech Methods and Resources: A Textbook for the Teacher of Speech, ed. Waldo W. Braden (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 398; Andrew Thomas Weaver, Gladys Louise Borchers, and Donald Kliese Smith, The Teaching of Speech (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952), p. 491; Karl F. Robinson and E. J. Kerikas, Teaching Speech Methods and Materials (New York: David McKay, 1970), p. 241; and Paul D. Holtzman, "Speech Criticism and Evaluation as Communication," Speech Teacher, 9(1960), 283.

[2]See, for instance, Robert N. Bostrom, "Classroom Criticism and Speech Attitudes," Central States Speech Journal, 14(1963), 27, 29; Eldon E. Baker, "Aligning Speech Evaluation and Behavioral Objectives," Speech Teacher, 16 (1967), 158-160; Win D. Kelley, "Objectivity in the Grading and Evaluating of Speeches," Speech Teacher, 14(1965), 54-58; Robert N. Bostrom, "The Effect of Speech Attitudes of Positive and Negative Evaluative Comments on Classroom Speaking," unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1961; Merlyn D. Albright, "The Response of Students in Fundamentals of Speech to Oral Criticism," unpublished M. A. thesis, Northern Illinois University, 1967; Jo A. Sprague, "An Investigation of the Written Critique Behavior of College Communication Instructors," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Prudue University, 1971; Robert Allen Vogel,

"An Analysis of the Relationship Between Teacher-Written Criticism and Improvement in Student Speech Performance," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1973; and Stephen Lee Young, "Student Perceptions of Helpfulness to Classroom Speech Criticism," unpublished M. A. thesis, Purdue University, 1972; and Judy C. Pearson, "The Effects of Sex and Sexism on the Criticism of Classroom Speeches," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1975.

[3]See, for example, Larry L. Barker, Robert J. Kibler, and Eugenia C. Hunter, "An Empirical Study of Overlap Rating Effects," Speech Teacher, 17(1968), 160-166; Douglas G. Bock, "The Effects of Persuasibility on Leniency, Halo, and Trait Errors in the Use of Speech Rating Scales," Speech Teacher, 29(1970), 296-300; Douglas G. Bock, "Reliability and Validity of Speech Rating Scales: Some Error Effects," Central States Speech Journal, 23(1972), 146-151; and Douglas G. Bock and E. Hope Bock, "The Effects of the Sex of the Experimenter, Expectancy Inductions, and Sex of the Rater on Leniency, Halo, and Trait Errors in Speech Rating Behavior," Communication Education, 26(1977), 298-306; Douglas G. Bock, Larry Powell, James T. Kitchens, and James W. Flavin, "The Influence of Sex Differences in Speech Evaluation: Situational and Media Effects," Communication Education, 26(1976), 143-153; Robert N. Bostrom, "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," Speech Teacher, 8(1964), 283-287; and Sprague, 44-46.

[4]Emil R. Pfister, "A Study of the Influence of Certain Selected Factors on the Ratings of Speech Performances," unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1955.

[5]Donald E. Sikkink, "An Experimental Study of the Effects on the Listener of Anticlimax Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech," Southern Speech Journal, 22 (1956), 73-78.

[6]Gerald R. Miller and Michael McReynolds, "Male Chauvinism and Source Competence: A Research Note," Speech Monographs, 40(1973), 154-155.

[7]Bock, Powell, Kitchens, and Flavin, 143-153.

[8]Alice I. Bryan and Walter H. Wilke, "Audience Tendencies in Rating Public Speakers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26(1942), 371-381.

[9]Randall C. Ruechelle, "An Experimental Study of Audience Recognition of Emotional and Intellectual Appeals in Persuasion," Speech Monographs, 25(1958), 49-58.

[10]Robert N. Bostrom and Alan P. Kemp, "Type of Speech, Sex of Speaker, and Sex of Subject as Factors Influencing Persuasion," Central States Speech Journal, 30(1968), 245-252.

[11]Carol Lee Sloman, "Sex Variables and Source Credibility: A Multivariate Investigation," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1974.

[12]Judy C. Pearson, "The Influence of the Level of Instruction and the Sex of the Teacher on the Criticism of Classroom Speeches," Iowa Journal of Speech Communication, Fall, 1980, in press.

[13]Franklyn S. Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, 16(1949), 190-202.

[14]Barbara Murphy Vigliano, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Sex of the Speaker and the Sex of the Listener on Message Comprehension and Judgment of Speaker Credibility," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 1974.

[15]Lowell Allen Lynn, "Language Emotionality, Source Credibility, and Sex Effects: An Experimental Study of Communication Perception," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.

[16]Sprague, 44-46.

[17]Wayne N. Thompson, "An Experimental Study of the Accuracy of Typical Speech Rating Techniques," Speech Monographs, 11(1944), 65-79.

[18]Bock, Powell, Kitchens, and Flavin, 143-153.

[19]Stephen Lee Young, "Student Perceptions of Helpfulness in Classroom Speech Criticism," Speech Teacher, 23(1974), 222-234.

[20]Sandra L. Bem, "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42(1974), 155-162 and Sandra Lipsitz Bem, "Androgyny Vs. the Tight Little Lives of Fluffy Women and Chesty Men," Psychology Today, 9(September 1975), 58.

[21]J. T. Spence, R. Helmreich, and J. Stapp, "Ratings on Self and Peers on Sex Role Attributes and their Relation to Self-Esteem and Conceptions of Masculinity and Femininity," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(1975), 29-39.

[22]A. B. Heilbrun, "Sex-Role, Instrumental-Expressive Behavior and Psychopathology in Females," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73(1968), 131-136 and A. B. Heilbrun, "Measurement of Masculine and Feminine Sex-Role Identitites as Independent Dimensions," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44(1976), 183-190.

[23]Sandra L. Bem, "Sex-Role Adaptability: One Consequence of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(1975), 634-643.

[24]Charles L. Montgomery and Michael Burgoon, "An Experimental Study of the Interactive Effects of Sex and Androgyny on Attitude Change," Communication Monographs, 44(1977), 130-135.

[25]Bock, 1970, 296-300.

[26]Dean Lobaugh, "Girls, Grades and I. Q.'s," Nations Schools, 30(1942), 42; Clifford Swenson, "Packing the Honor Society," Clearing House, 16(1942), 521-524; Mark C. Shinnerer, "Failure Ratio: Two Boys to One Girl," Clearing House, 18(1944), 264-270; Robert Scriven Carter, "How Invalid are Marks Assigned by Teachers?" Journal of Educational Psychology, 43(1952), 218-228.

[27]R. Lippitt and M. Gold, "Classroom Social Structure as a Mental Health Problem," Journal of Social Issues, 15 (1959), 40-49; Albert F. de Groat and George G. Thompson, "A Study of the Distribution of Teacher Approval and Disapproval Among Sixth-Grade Children," Journal of Experimental Education, 18(1949), 57-75; and William J. Meyer and George G. Thompson, "Sex Differences in the Distribution of Teacher Approval and Disapproval Among Sixth Grade Pupils," Journal of Educational Psychology, 47(1956), 385-396.

[28]Robert L. Spaulding, "Achievement, Creativity, and Self-Concept Correlates of Teacher-Pupil Transactions in Elementary Schools," Cooperative Research Project No. 1352, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington D. C., 1963 and Walter B. Waetjen, "Is Learning Sexless?" Education Digest, 28(1962).

[29]O. L. Davis, Jr. and June Jenkinson Slobodian, "Teacher Behavior Toward Boys and Girls During First Grade Reading Instruction," American Educational Research Journal, 4(1967), 261-269; Philip W. Jackson, Melvin L. Silberman, and Bernice J. Wolfson, "Signs of Personal Involvement in Teachers' Descriptions of Their Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, 60(1969), 22-27; Jere E. Brophy and Thomas L. Good, "Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Performance: Some Behavioral Data," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61(1970), 365-374; Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, "Questioned Equality for Grade One Boys and Girls," The Reading Teacher, 25(1971), 247-252 and Roy Martin, "Student Sex and Behavior as Determinants of the Type and Frequency of Teacher-Student Contacts," Journal of School Psychology, 10(1972), 339-347.

[30]Thomas L. Good, J. Neville Sikes, and Jere E. Brophy, "Effects of Teacher Sex and Student Sex in Classroom Interaction," Journal of Educational Psychology, 65(1973), 74-87.

[31]Larry L. Barker, "Irrelevant Factors and Speech Evaluation," Southern Speech Journal, 32(1966), 10-18.

[32]Sloman, 1974.

[33]Pfister, 1955.

[34]Sprague, 1971, 44-46 and Pearson, 1975.

[35]Vigliano, 1974.

[36]Bostrom and Kemp, 1968, 245-252.

[37]Joe M. Ball, "The Relationship Between the Ability to Speak Effectively and the Primary Mental Abilities, Verbal Comprehension and General Reasoning," Speech Monographs, 25(1958), 285-290.

[38]Anthony Mulac and A. Robert Sherman, "Relationships Among Four Parameters of Speaker Evaluation: Speech Skill, Source Credibility, Subjective Speech Anxiety, and Behavioral Speech Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 42(1975), 302-310.

[39]Bostrom, 1964, 283-287.

[40]Bock, 1970, 296-300.

[41]Pearson, 1975.

[42]Judy C. Pearson, "The Effects of Sex and Sexism on the Criticism of Classroom Speeches," International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May, 1979.

[43]See, for example, J. Worell, "Sex Roles and Psychological Well-Being: Perspectives on Methodology," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(1978), 777-791 and J. A. Kelly and J. Worell, "New Formulations of Sex Roles and Androgyny: A Critical Review," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45(1977), 1101-1115.

[44]J. T. Spence, R. Helmreich, and J. Stapp, "The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A Measure of Sex Role Stereotypes and Masculinity-Femininity," JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4(1974), 127.

[45]See, for example, Ruth Gross, Nick Batlis, Arnold Small and Carol Erdwins, "Factor Structure of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47(1979), 1122-1124; P. Gaudreau, "Factor Analyses of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45(1977), 299-302, and J. A. Wakefield, Jr., J. Sasek, A. F. Friedman, and J. D. Bowden, "Androgyny and Other Measures of Masculinity-Femininity," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44(1976), 766-770.

[46]Good, Sikes, and Brophy, 1973, 74-87.

[47]Vigliano, 1974.

[48]Ball, 1958, 285-290.